



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/009,460	04/29/2002	Juergen Lorenz	H 4136 PCT/US	4081
23377	7590	04/06/2005	EXAMINER	
WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP ONE LIBERTY PLACE, 46TH FLOOR 1650 MARKET STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103			BISSETT, MELANIE D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1711	

DATE MAILED: 04/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/009,460	Applicant(s) LORENZ ET AL.	
	Examiner Melanie D. Bissett	Art Unit 1711	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 March 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 14-19 and 22-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14-19 and 22-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

TS

[Handwritten signature]

1. The rejections from the previous Office action have been withdrawn based on the applicant's amendments and arguments. However, a new rejection has been provided.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

3. Claims 14-18 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Datcoop.

4. The reference discloses thermoplastic compositions comprising either rubber waste or leather fibers with a tenside surfactant (abstract). Examples show 15-50% by weight of hide fibers mixed with the balance of an ethylene-vinyl acetate copolymer/polyethylene blend. Additives may also be included.

5. Claims 14-17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Battelle.

6. Battelle teaches a composite material comprising a styrene-butadiene rubber having an open cell porous structure, a non-porous coating of the same elastomer, and containing up to 20% by weight of leather fibers (abstract).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

8. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Datcoop in view of Addie.

9. Datcoop applies as above, teaching the general claimed composition and method but failing to teach the leather fiber lengths. Addie discloses leather product materials, where leather fibers having lengths of about 0.05-0.75 in (1.27-19 mm) are used. Addie teaches that the fiber length is important to optimize processing and cohesion (col. 3 lines 43-55). Thus, it is the examiner's position that it would have been prima facie obvious to employ leather fibers having the claimed lengths in Datcoop's invention to optimize cohesion and processing of the composites.

10. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Datcoop in view of Addie as applied to claim 23 above and further in view of Kuchler et al.

11. Datcoop and Addie apply as above, teaching thermoplastic compositions useful for walking surfaces (p. 8 lines 10-15) but failing to teach the claimed manufacture process including the treatment, dewatering, and drying steps. Kuchler teaches aqueous plastic dispersions of vinyl polymers and filler, where the filler comprises fibrous material (abstract). Preferred fibers include leather fibers (col. 3 lines 20-36). The reference teaches a process of adding fibers to a plastic dispersion, treating the dispersion with aluminum sulfate in an additive amount of 5-20% by weight, removing the water, and drying the mixture to form a sheet (col. 3 line 52-col. 4 line 13). This process is used to form sheets of vibration-damping properties. Since Datcoop is concerned with walking surfaces, it is the examiner's position that it would have been

prima facie obvious to employ the methods of KÜchler's invention to form materials of improved vibration damping properties.

12. Claims 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Datcoop in view of Toyota.

13. Datcoop applies as above for the making of leather products, failing to mention the use of hot-melt films to form leather laminates. Toyota teaches a method of bonding leather to a backing material via a hot-melt adhesive to form seating articles having improved mechanical strength (abstract). The molten adhesive would inherently form a film between the two outer layers. It is the examiner's position that it would have been prima facie obvious to use Toyota's article-forming method to form leather articles having improved appearance while having improved mechanical strength.


Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 14-19 and 22-26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Melanie D. Bissett whose telephone number is (571) 272-1068. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Seidleck can be reached on (571) 272-1078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Melanie D. Bissett
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1711

mdb